DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 515 TM 035 417

AUTHOR	Costa, Alicia, Sister; Elseginy, Siham; Lusco, Ellen; Pinney, Jean
TITLE	Vouchers: A School Choice.
PUB DATE	2003-11-00
NOTE	55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Biloxi, MS, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Educational Vouchers; *Elementary Secondary Education; Free Choice Transfer Programs; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *School Choice; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

Voucher proposals are flourishing nationwide, pushed by the fact that too many children are trapped in failing schools, and there is a great deal of disagreement about educational vouchers. This paper traces the history of voucher programs and describes some voucher programs in different cities (Milwaukee, Wisconsin and Cleveland, Ohio) and in the state of Florida. Evaluations of these programs are reviewed. The proposed voucher program for Louisiana is described. Issues surrounding vouchers are discussed, as are the reasons voters have rejected vouchers in some places. Research findings about vouchers have been mixed, with some studies suggesting that they increase student achievement and parent and student satisfaction, and other studies indicating that they do not have these effects. Commentary by the individual authors is presented, with one author making the point that limiting private school autonomy may be too great a price to pay to participate in voucher programs. Three others outline reasons for believing vouchers undermine the public schools. (Contains 70 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running Head: Vouchers

Vouchers: A School Choice

ED 482 515

Sister Alicia Costa
Siham Elseginy
Ellen Lusco
Jean Pinney
University of New Orleans

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Pinney
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

As presented at the
MSERA Conference
Biloxi, Mississippi 2003

TM035417

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Running Head: Vouchers

Vouchers: A School Choice

Sister Alicia Costa
Siham Elseginy
Ellen Lusco
Jean Pinney
University of New Orleans

As presented at the
MSERA Conference
Biloxi, Mississippi 2003

Context

Introduction

Vouchers have been around since the 1700's when they were issued for students to attend private or parochial schools if the area where they lived did not have a public school ("A Long Road," 2002). These types of vouchers are still used today in several states including Vermont and Maine. However, the vouchers in the news lately go far beyond the scope of these original vouchers.

A Nation at Risk sounded its alarm nearly 20 years ago regarding the poor quality of America's schools. School assessments, opinion surveys, and school report cards have only confirmed unacceptably low levels of academic achievement by students, particularly in urban schools. Recently almost all candidates for political office, even presidential candidates, have made education a top priority and have introduced policy recommendations to address the problem as they interpret it. School choice, via vouchers, has once again surfaced as an attempt to reform education and is touted as a means of improving educational efficiency. This type of school choice would allow parents with children living in poverty to choose not only what they deem to be the best schools, but also the safest schools. And these may include both public and private schools.

> "Voucher programs are designed to provide the ability to choose directly to eligible families in the form of a voucher or scholarship, however, the funding may flow to the family or to a school. The amount of funding provided is typically equivalent to the per student state allotment (normally provided to the local district); the student is responsible for providing the remainder of funding

required to attend the school of his/her choice. In addition, vouchers may be funded from local, state, or private funding sources" (American Institutes of Research, 2000, p. 1).

Voucher proposals are flourishing nationwide. The idea of school vouchers refuses to die even though voters have repeatedly rejected vouchers since 1972 (Democratic Policy Committee, 2002). When the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the Cleveland voucher system in the June 2002 decision in *Zelman V. Simmons-Harris*, it opened the door to a wider range of voucher discussions across the nation. This decision is considered the most important one regarding education since *Brown vs. Board of Education* (1954) for it will allow more states to attempt to integrate some type of voucher program into their respective school systems (Nagourney, 2002). The government has assigned students to particular schools based upon geographic location for over 100 years (Reed & Overton, 2003). However, the U.S. Supreme Court decision may very well change this dynamic. The battle is now on to remove state constitutional roadblocks to school choice voucher programs, which come mainly in the form of Blaine laws or "compelled support" provisions. These amendments to state constitutions respectively prohibit government funds from going to religious sects or institutions, and provide that no one be compelled to attend or support a church without consent (Walsh, 2002).

There has been a tremendous shift in the U.S. and global economies, such that, a service- and information-based economy has surpassed the extractive industries of agriculture, fishing, mining, and manufacturing. Following World War II, an individual with an eighth grade education could support a family, buy a house and a car, and pay

college tuition on a factory job's salary. Today, however, a person invariably needs a college education to maintain a middle-class lifestyle. Office assistants, auto mechanics, medical technicians all make use of sophisticated electronic equipment, and farming has become a highly analytical enterprise. The information age and the phenomenon of globalization, in which computers connect us to the rest of the world in a matter of seconds, mandate that students be prepared for increasing amounts of knowledge beyond the basics of book learning (Danielson, 2002).

However, poor and minority students, particularly African Americans and Hispanics, have been achieving at levels far below those of white, middle-class students in basic reading, writing, and mathematics skills. Our public schools have once again reverted to segregated schools in which poor and minority students are overwhelmingly enrolled in schools with the fewest resources and the least qualified teachers. With the focus on standards-based reform, this disparity has become quite evident. "...Only 32 percent of fourth-graders can read skillfully at grade level. Sadly, most of the 68 percent who can't read well are minority children and those who live in poverty" (U.S. Department of Education, 2002a, ¶ 1). The U.S. economy and the profitability of U.S. companies depend largely on a workforce that is literate and highly skilled.

In addition to this economic agenda, there is the ethical obligation of developing all students to their full potential. It is the common belief that education is the key to success and that the role of public schools is to provide a comprehensive education for all students. However, for those living in poverty, the prospects to improve their status is tremendously reduced by the lack of resources and social networks. It is through education that young people can grow and escape the snare of poverty that is apparent for

those in the lower socioeconomic strata. Ideally, schools have the responsibility to help break the cycle of poverty and ignorance by ensuring the success of all students (Danielson, 2002). This is the impetus pushing the frenzy about vouchers today. Too many of our children are trapped in failing schools and deserve access to a quality education.

The National Scene

In November, 1922, the state of Oregon passed the Compulsory Education Act, which required every child from the ages of eight to sixteen to attend a public school. Failure to do so was declared a misdemeanor. A Roman Catholic organization, the Society of Sisters, challenged this edict, and in 1925 the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the right of parents to send their children to private schools in the *Pierce vs. Society of Sisters* case. However, the ruling stipulated that the State has the power to require children to attend some school and the power to regulate schools to ensure that they are doing a good job at education ("Supreme Court Decisions," 2003).

Milton Friedman, a conservative economist, first introduced educational vouchers in 1955 (Reed & Overton, 2003). Friedman conveyed that educational resources would be allocated more efficiently in an educational market rather than schools that are run by the government. Parents would be issued vouchers in the amount equal to the per-pupil expenditure in the public schools and could be used at the school of choice, whether public or private (Hadderman & Smith, 2002; Kowalski, 2002).

"In the early 1950's, racial segregation in public schools was the norm across America. Although all the schools in a given district were supposed to be equal, most black schools were far inferior to their white counterparts" (Cozzens, 1995, ¶ 1). In the

Brown vs. Board of Education decision in 1954, the Supreme Court struck down the "separate but equal" doctrine of *Plessy* (1896) for public education. However, after this decision, the Virginia Legislature created a grant for tuition in 1956 to allow students to attend any non-sectarian school in the district, thus, permitting them to avoid attendance at the integrated schools (Molnar, 2001). In 1967 the Supreme Court affirmed an appeals court decision that struck down a Louisiana law establishing a similar voucher-type system that would have provided a way of getting around racial integration in the public schools. The lower court declared in *Poindexter v. Louisiana Financial Assistance Commission*, "The United States constitution does not permit the State to perform acts indirectly through private persons which it is forbidden to do directly" (Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 2001, Poindexter v. Louisiana section). It is the civil rights movement and litigation over desegregating the schools that have influenced the movement toward equalizing learning opportunities. Magnet schools designed to offset segregation may be considered early experiments with school choice (Willie, 1991, as cited in Kowlaski, 2000).

The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 put the federal government on the front lines in an attempt to equalize educational opportunity. Under Title I, federal programs supplemented the capacity of schools to meet the needs of all students—the disadvantaged students as well as those in special education. "Federal programs also mandated that parents be involved in school-site governance of Title I starting in 1965. Over time, federal requirements for parent involvement have strengthened through requirements that parents approve individual educational plans" (Kowalski, 2000, p. 54).

In the 1980s, the issue of the mediocrity of education once again became an issue. John Chubb and Terry Moe advanced the issue of school choice in 1990 with the book *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*. They argued that the system of direct democratic control only increases the voice of bureaucrats and creates less say for parents and students. "Schools are doomed to be organized like clones, which inhibits their need to operate with discretion. In order to make schools succeed, they must operate like the market. In this way, schools which organize effectively (and thus produce better students) are likely to be naturally selected" (Stephen Scibelli, 2001, Introduction section). Until this day, school reform has been a constant debate.

There is a renewed emphasis being placed on school choice today. The *No child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (NCLB, the most recent update of ESEA) allows school choice for parents of students in failing schools in that they will be able to send their children to another public school in their area and even take part of the federal funds from Title I to get their children tutoring, after school or weekend help, and even summer school classes. Title I funds may also be used for services and equipment at non-public institutions when it is needed. The federal E-rate program allows private and religious schools to use funds for building computer technology and on-line learning programs (U. S. Department of Education, 2002e). However, critics believe the NCLB is designed to ensure that public schools fail and may become a vehicle for vouchers due to its rigid and inflexible approach in the regulations. They do not see these regulations as being realistic (especially for special-education students and those who speak English as a second language), in that all students in all socio-economic subgroups would be required to demonstrate steady proficiency in standardized tests. In some districts there are far too

few schools to have really anything to choose from. Furthermore, NCLB comes at a time when many states are facing budget deficits; thereby making compliance with the law's costly mandates all the more difficult (Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 2003a).

Two bills also were introduced into the U.S. Senate of the 107th Congress allowing states to provide for school choice. S.717 (April 5, 2001) provides for educational opportunities for disadvantaged children and S.2883 (August 1, 2002) similarly would allow for states to design a program to increase parental choice in special education (Library of Congress, n.d.). During the last 20 years the U. S. Supreme Court has "recognized and supported federal programs that give public funds directly to individuals who then choose from any number of programs—private or public—to meet child-care needs, social-service demands, even educational improvement" (U. S. Department of Education, 2002d, ¶ 2). The most recent case, which upheld the constitutionality of educational vouchers, was decided in *Zelman vs. Simmons-Harris*. This case focuses on the constitutionality of a state providing tuition aid as part of a general assistance program to low-income parents and authorizing them to use that aid to enroll their children in a private school of their choosing, without regard to whether the school is religiously affiliated.

Educational programs have long been recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court which allow public funds to go to religiously affiliated private schools. Even before vouchers were introduced, the Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the state of Louisiana providing free secular textbooks for all students, including those enrolled in religious schools, in *Cochran vs. Louisiana State Board of Education* in 1930. The court

declared that the law was intended to benefit children, not the religious schools. This concept today is known as the "child benefit theory" (Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 2001). In the *Everson vs. Board of Education of Ewing* in 1947, the use of public school buses to transport private and parochial school students was upheld by the Supreme Court. However, the decision also established the principle that "no tax" should go to support religious activities or institutions. In 1983 the Supreme Court upheld Minnesota's tax deduction for private school tuition, including tuition at religious schools, in *Mueller vs. Allen.* A 1986 decision approved the use of government scholarship money by a blind student going to a divinity school in *Witters vs. Washington Department of Services for the Blind.* In *Zobrest vs. Catalina Foothills School District*, the court approved the use of a publicly funded interpreter by a deaf student in a Catholic high school in 1993. Public school teachers were allowed to give remedial instruction inside private, religious schools in 1997 in the *Agostini vs. Felton* case. In the *Mitchell vs. Helms* (2000) case originating in Jefferson Parish, the court upheld loaning materials and equipment, such as computers, software, and library books, to religious schools. The rationale was the program provided aid to the public and private school students on a religiously neutral basis (U. S. Department of Education, 2002d, ¶ 3). Justice Clarence Thomas said: "It is the students and their parents—not the government—who, through their choice of school, determined who receives Chapter 2 funds. The aid follows the child" (Walsh, 2000, ¶ 3)

The federal government has a history of supporting private and religious groups when they serve the secular interest. Pell Grants are an example of the federal government enabling college students to choose the learning institution of their choice,

public or private, regardless of religious affiliation. The G.I. Bill is another example in which veterans are rewarded with federally supported higher education at the schools of their choice (U. S. Department of Education, 2002e).

The 34th Annual Phi Delta Kappa Gallup Poll (2002) reports results from two questions asked regarding private schooling at public expense: a.) Do you favor or oppose allowing students and parents to choose a private school to attend at public expense? (b) A proposal has been made that would allow parents to send their school-age children to any public, private, or church-related school they choose. For those parents choosing nonpublic schools, the government would pay all or part of the tuition. Would you favor or oppose this proposal in your state? (Rose & Gallup, 2002) Since 1995 the results have consistently shown less than 50% of the national total surveyed in favor of "allowing students and parents to choose a private school to attend at public expense" with a high of 46% peaking last year. Of those in favor of this option 52% were urbanites, 45% were from the suburbs, and 41% were rural dwellers. The second question was first asked in 1996. The proportion in favor started out at 43%, peaked at 51% in 1998 and 1999, and then dropped to 44% last year. Forty-nine percent of whites and 63% of non-whites were in favor of the school choice option of the second question.

Recognizing that the 2002 survey had been completed before the U. S. Supreme Court's decision upholding the constitutionality of Cleveland's voucher program, the Gallup Organization decided to delve deeper into the issues in a poll it conducted during the week of August 14, 2002. Examining people's positions regarding vouchers included a question to ascertain how closely they had followed the news about school vouchers. The results indicate that half the public follows news about school vouchers; half does

not. More than half admitted they did not know enough to decide whether they favor or oppose vouchers. Among those who follow vouchers in the news, support is relatively high in contrast to those who do not follow the news about school vouchers. More than half the public favors choice if the choice allows parents to choose a public school and gives the government the option of paying all or part of the tuition for private schools (Rose & Gallup, 2002). Obviously, the public is still divided on this issue.

States

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Cleveland, Ohio, and the State of Florida are the best known publicly funded voucher programs. The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program (MPCP) is the nation's oldest program giving low-income families vouchers to enroll their children in non-religious private schools. It has grown from 341 students at seven schools in 1990-1991 to 10,882 students at 106 schools in 2001-2002. Private schools participating in the program must admit all eligible choice students and use a random selection process when applicants exceed available space. It was challenged twice—first when enacted in 1990, and again when it was expanded in 1995 to include religious schools. The Wisconsin Supreme Court upheld it each time. Participation of religious schools was delayed due to the three-year legal challenge. However, on June 10, 1998 the Court upheld the constitutionality of all aspects of the expanded MPCP. The U.S. Supreme Court declined to hear an appeal.

There have been seven evaluations of the MPCP issued by the state of Wisconsin, and secondary analyses conducted by Harvard and Princeton Universities. The state evaluations indicated that there were no substantial gains over the life of the program between choice and Milwaukee public school students over a five-year period. However,

contrary to the norm for inner-city students, average scores do not decline as the students enter higher grades. The Harvard research team found statistically significant gains in reading and math scores for the MPCP students, but the Princeton teams only found such gains for math (American Education Reform Council, 2001c).

Florida's A+ Opportunity Scholarship Program (A+OSP) provides students with vouchers to attend private or other public schools if they attend schools designated "failing" for two years in a four-year period. The scholarship they receive is valid through the highest grade served by the failing school and can continue through high school if the assigned high school has a rating below C. The state started awarding A-to-F grades to schools in 1999. Seventy-eight schools were labeled failures the first year. In 2000-2001 academic year no Florida school earned an F, thus no additional vouchers were offered for the second straight year. In 2001-2002, 47 Pensacola students attended five private schools and 23 Pensacola students attended other public schools. In 1999-2000 only two schools had two failing designations in four years, both in Pensacola. A state-sponsored evaluation conducted by Florida State University, Harvard University, and the Manhattan Institute concluded that the A+OSP has had a positive impact in that it was successful in motivating failing schools to improve their academic performance (American Education Reform Council, 2001b).

Florida also has the McKay Scholarship program for students with disabilities whose parents are dissatisfied with their progress at their assigned public school regardless of whether that school received a poor grade from the state. These students may transfer to another public school or private school. This program initially operated in 1999-2000 as a pilot project in Sarasota County with 977 students. In this program the

money follows the child and is worth between $5,000 and $17,000. Parents pay the difference if private tuition is higher. In 2001-2002, the program had expanded statewide to 4,997 students who participated with 357 private Florida schools accepting the eligible students.

The Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program (CSTP) allows students in grades K-8 to receive scholarships to attend secular or religious private schools. CSTP also provides tutoring grants for students in public schools. In its six year history the scholarship portion has grown from 1,994 students in 1996-1997 to 4,457 in 2001-2002. Scholarships and tutoring grants are awarded by lottery, with priority for low-income families. No more than half of new recipients may be children previously enrolled in private schools. The maximum amount awarded has been $2,250 since the program's inception. The family must pay the remaining tuition or volunteer equivalent hours at the school the child attends. Special needs students may receive larger scholarships, based on individual needs which cover 100%. It is this plan that has been upheld by the U. S. Supreme Court in *Zelman vs. Simmons-Harris*.

Two evaluations have been done on CSTP: one conducted by the Indiana Center for Evaluation at Indiana University and the other by the Program on Education Policy and Governance at Harvard University. The Indiana report concluded that students enrolled in the scholarship program for the full three years continue to perform slightly, but statistically significantly, higher than public school students. Both reports indicate that parents of scholarship recipients were considerably more satisfied with their school than parents of students in public schools (American Education Reform Council, 2001a).

Following *Zelman vs. Simmons-Harris*, Maine's Attorney General Rowe "issued a legal opinion stating that Maine was not required to offer vouchers or pay tuition at religious schools" (Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 2003b, ¶ 3). Pat Robertson's American Center for Law and Justice has filed a federal lawsuit asserting that the state is discriminating against religious schools in its stance toward vouchers. Maine does allow communities that do not have their own high schools to pay tuition at secular private schools. The Institute for Justice is also suing in state court. The Institute for Justice also announced plans in November to sue Vermont which has a school choice plan similar to Maine.

Locally

In Louisiana the voucher discussion has focused around the state's accountability system. The state accountability program section 2.006.09 allows students to leave a failing public school and go to another school (Louisiana Office of School Accountability, 2003). This section was meant to allow students to choose another public school to attend, but proponents of the voucher program in Louisiana are saying there are not enough spaces available in the successful schools for these children. Florida has a similar clause but their clause allows children to choose from public, private or parochial schools ("A Long Road," 2002).

Louisiana has already approved (June 2001 and engineered by John Hainkel in the legislature) a voucher plan for 600 New Orleans Preschoolers (4-year-olds) from low-income families to attend secular or religious private schools using public funds, worth $4,700 per student. The vouchers are to be distributed by lottery. The $3 million program was being funded with surplus federal welfare money as a one-year pilot. "Federal and

state child-care subsidies often allow families to place children in a wide range of settings. State pre-kindergarten programs also typically involve a host of providers, not just public schools" (Robelen, 2001, p. 29). The bill that provides the money originally said it should be spent on "faith-based initiatives" and be handled by the Catholic Charities Archdiocese of New Orleans (Sentell & Millhollon, 2001). However, access to the money was expanded to nonsectarian private schools so as not to have delayed its implementation by a lawsuit. There are 41 private schools eligible to receive vouchers, but only two of 12 eligible Non-catholic Schools decided to participate; 15 out of 29 eligible Catholic schools opened their doors (Nolan, 2001).

Twenty-three public schools have been designated by the state as academically unacceptable. Twenty-one of these are located in New Orleans. As the state raises the cutoff score for academically unacceptable schools, 103 schools (63 in New Orleans) have been identified by the state as likely to fall into that category next year (Thevenot & Scott, 2003). Frustrated with the slow pace of education reform in New Orleans, Governor Foster is now proposing a private school voucher system for the state primarily directed at failing schools in Orleans Parish. This proposed small voucher pilot program would give parents of students in a limited number of failing schools the right to transfer to a private school. Foster agrees to have private schools submit to a similar level of accountability as public schools; however, the door is cracked for a compromise. Private schools may have to start giving their students the LEAP test and publishing test scores by school.

Representative Crane filed House Bill #1337 for vouchers which is being backed by Governor Foster (Crane, 2003). Crane's bill calls for a four year pilot program to

begin with the 2004-2005 school year which would allow students attending or who would attend a failing public school to receive a voucher for tuition at an approved non-public school not to exceed the state portion of per pupil aid to the district. The student would be allowed to continue in the school to its highest grade (up through eighth grade) as long as the child and the school remain eligible. The bill also mandates the schools accepting vouchers must be state approved, administered nationally recognized standardized tests for at least two years prior to the voucher program and make the results of those tests available to parents. The nonpublic schools are not required to accept any student who has had any disciplinary action for behavioral problems at the prior school. This bill calls for a gradual implementation of the state accountability program beginning with the first year administering the math and reading portions of the norm-referenced tests used in the public schools. The second year would require criterion referenced testing in math and reading and the third year the schools would receive a School Performance Score (SPS). Any school participating in the voucher program receiving a failing SPS will be dropped from the program. Only voucher students would be held to the consequences of high-stakes testing.

House Bill #1739 filed by Representative Tucker is similar to Crane's bill but falls short on the accountability issue (Tucker, 2003). Tucker's bill calls for standardized test results for five years prior to the voucher program as opposed to Crane's two years. The only accountability in the Tucker plan is norm-referenced testing for voucher students which are to be administered at a site other than the nonpublic school.

Senator Dean filed a version of the voucher plan as Senate Bill #943 for the regular session (Dean, 2003). This bill allows for students enrolled in an academically

unacceptable school to apply for a scholarship to attend a private school. This program is for students in grades one through seven. This bill also allows students to attend any other public school in their district or an adjacent district not in corrective action. Dean's bill also requires all scholarship recipients take the norm referenced and criterion- referenced tests given in the public schools and publish the results. The scholarship will be in the amount the state pays per pupil or the tuition of the school – whichever is less.

The New Orleans Archdiocesan Plan originally called for $3,000 in state money to be given to parents of children in failing schools in grades K-8. The additional money that most public systems spend per pupil from local taxes would remain in the public school system. This plan is modeled on Cleveland's voucher program. Archdiocesan officials oppose giving their students the LEAP test or releasing test scores by school. Their philosophical position differs with the state in that they believe tests are just one measure of student achievement and publishing scores for individual schools narrows the curriculum, leads to teaching to the test, and tends to cause harmful competition among schools (Thevenot & Scott, 2003; Elie, 2003).

The Archdiocese is not the only private school group that has some issues with Foster's voucher plan. The National Association of Independent Schools has a problem with the part of the plan which requires schools to accept all vouchers, and therefore, not allowing them to reject students who do not fit their mission (Waller, 2003). This group also disagrees with the testing portion of Foster's voucher proposal.

Senate Bill #985, sponsored by Senators Michot and Hainkel and Representative Lancaster (2003), basically is the Archdiocese plan. This bill provides payment for tutoring or private school tuition for students in failing public schools in grades one

through eight. The amount of tuition will be the portion of the per pupil expenditure paid by the state or the amount of tuition, whichever is less. This bill also allows the private schools to impose their own criteria for enrollment on voucher students. It further allows the schools to be of one gender and to only admit those special education students whose needs they can meet. This bill also allows for voucher money to go to students already in the private schools and their siblings. The only testing requirement in this bill is students are to be tested annually using a nationally recognized norm-referenced test.

Another bill for vouchers has been filed with the House by P. Bruneau. House Bill #854 differs from the other two bills in it is the only voucher plan which calls for annual auditing of the schools receiving vouchers and a phasing in of the program one grade level per year (Bruneau, 2003). This bill does not call for testing or reporting of scores but it does require the schools to have no rules for voucher students different from those applying to the rest of the student body. This is the only voucher bill filed that does not have any family income requirements thus opening vouchers to any student who would normally attend a failing school.

A limited voucher bill was filed by Senator Johnson. This bill calls for vouchers for children in preschool, kindergarten, and first grade (Johnson, 2003). The only requirement for this voucher is that students are from low income families residing in a parish with at least four hundred eighty thousand people. The program would expire with the end of the 2008-2009 school year.

What Are the Issues?

Proponents

"The empowerment and transformation of parents into active agents is the foundation of educational choice theory" (Reed & Overton, 2003, p. 49). This view purports that parents will take greater interest in their children's education if they have control over it. Proponents claim that vouchers have the capacity to empower parents, for it is not the government making the decision to send kids to religious schools, but parents directing their tax dollars to the school of their choice. They believe "that parents should be treated like consumers and allowed to use public funds to 'purchase' an education for their children" (Close Up Foundation, 2003, p. 97). The argument focuses on low-income parents having the same opportunity to choose a good school for their children as parents who can afford to move to better school districts or pay for private school.

Additionally, the ability to choose schools will cause competition between schools that will result in school improvement (Rauch, 2002). Supporters maintain that holding schools accountable for their performance would force them to improve. In the short term, it is believed that enrollments will drop at substandard schools, but the risk of closure would force teachers and administrators of those schools to fix the problems. The director of the Milwaukee public schools (MPS), John Gardner, indicated that improvement of the MPS during the time of rapid expansion of educational options had occurred. He argues that these improvements would not have been possible without the existence of the school choice programs. State Representative Christine Sinicki who is an opponent to school choice also conceded that choice forced the public school system to make necessary changes for improvement (American Education Reform Council,

2001). The Florida A-Plus Accountability system and school choice program offers vouchers to students in failing schools. It is a sanction for repeated failure of schools and as such the Florida schools "that foresee the imminent challenge of having to compete for their students take the necessary steps to retain their students and stave off that competition" (Greene, 2001, p.8). Other countries, such as Denmark and Sweden, report similar results. Denmark has always maintained the parents' right to choose their children's education which has resulted in government schools, motivated by competition, to respond to parental concerns. Since 1991, Sweden has also had a voucher program which has had the same results (The Fraser Institute, 1999).

Other proponent arguments claim that students who use vouchers learn more than if they had stayed in government schools (The Fraser Institute, 1999); vouchers serve as a way for low-income parents to get their children out of failing public schools and receive immedicate help; vouchers are a means of relieving overcrowding in the public school: and vouchers foster higher levels of integration in private schools. While the debate revolves primarily around vouchers' effects on schools, Nechyba suggests "vouchers are possibly the best desegregation and urban-renewal program that the United States has hardly ever tried" (Rauch, 2002, ¶). Nechyba's research suggests that introducing vouchers would have a large positive effect on neighborhoods in which the average incomes in poor districts would rise 20 or 30 percent, with the tax base going up dramatically. He reasons that upon making vouchers available, there are those parents who would be willing to move into an undesirable public-school district in order to send their children to private school. These are the people who would ordinarily stretch their budgets to live in communities with good public schools.

Opponents

In the 2000 election, ballots in California and Michigan offered two different voucher plans. Neither passed. A provision for vouchers supported by President Bush was omitted from the 2001 education reform law which requires schools to meet new standards in reading and math proficiency (Close Up Foundation, 2003). Voters in nineteen states have rejected voucher-like programs; Colorado voters rejected a proposed constitutional amendment that would have allowed parochial schools to receive public funds through a complicated tuition tax-credit scheme. While twenty states have introduced voucher bills, only two have been put into law.

The Louisiana State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) passed a resolution that spurns Governor Foster's voucher plan headed for the legislature March 31. On Thursday, February 20, BESE voted for an anti-voucher statement indicating that vouchers would undermine the 5-year-old state's high-stakes accountability program and hurt public education by diverting state education money. The only dissenting vote came form Gerald Dill who expressed his displeasure saying that the board was wrong "to disapprove of vouchers in concept without first looking at how they might be applied in Louisiana" (Krupa, 2003, p. A3). Louisiana Federation of Teachers President Fred Skelton agreed with BESE's position and commented on his hopes that the statement would sway lawmakers to kill all voucher bills. Teachers unions and public school officials argue that vouchers would drain money from already struggling schools (Waller, 2003). Money put into vouchers could be spent on repairing school buildings and erecting new ones.

> Opponents have stressed that voucher programs will hurt public school funding by steering tax dollars to private schools, and that evidence of student achievement gains is inconclusive. Opponents have also warned of the potential for increased segregation by race and income as voucher schools may attract the best students from the traditional public schools (United States General Accounting Office, 2001).

The Louisiana Association of School Superintendents (LASS) has also made its opposition to vouchers known. Meeting in Monroe, LA on March 6, 2003, the group unanimously gave thumbs down to any voucher proposal that did not require private and parochial schools to meet strict public-school standards. LASS specified a number of these standards to be required of private and parochial schools in order to be eligible to receive vouchers. They must have an open-door policy on race and economic status; administer the LEAP test; provide lunch and transportation for students; and institute attendance zones similar to those of the nearest public school ("Superintendents Vote," 2003, p. A2).

The *No Child Left Behind Act* demands accountability for better results from public schools, teachers, and students. However, there are different rules that apply to private schools for which they are not obligated to such accountability. Private schools do not have to take any current state or the newly required annual tests, and they are not required to accept all students, that is, students with limited English proficiency, special education students, homeless students, or students with discipline problems (Democratic Policy Committee, 2002). Vouchers could, if not carefully crafted, create some problems for the independence of private schools and could nationalize private education. The

education bureaucracy would have a difficult time keeping their hands off private schools, which will lead to the loss of private school autonomy. Such regulations could include those found in public schools: criteria for hiring and firing teachers, selecting students, and even determining curricula (Bresler, 2002).

As evidenced by the Louisiana opinions recently published by BESE and LASS, opponents take the position that vouchers will undermine public schools. They contend that applying market principles to the school system will chip away at the "common concern" for quality public schooling and will only encourage every parent and taxpayer to look out only for themselves. Implementation of voucher programs will send a clear message that society is giving up on public education and with the help of taxpayers' dollars, private schools would be filled with a handful of the best and the most motivated students from the innercities. Some public schools would be left with fewer dollars to teach the poorest of the poor and other students who, for one reason or another, were not private school material. The depletion of the brightest and most motivated students from the public schools would only be counterproductive in that the very students and their parents who would be most likely to bring about positive change would leave the public school system.

Opponents also argue that there is no solid evidence that voucher systems improve schools or raise student test scores (Close Up Foundation, 2003). An evaluation by Princeton University found that students in Milwaukee's public school program, which used extra resources to reduce class sizes, outperformed regular students and voucher students in reading, and did as well as voucher students and better than public school students in math (Democratic Policy Committee, 2002). Statistically significant

achievement gains for voucher students are negligible. The gains have not been consistent, have been far below projections, and give no compelling evidence to justify expanding vouchers (National Education Association, 2002).

Of all of the arguments made by opponents, the most important is what is believed to be a breach of the 'separation of church and state' principle. Public tax money would go to church-sponsored parochial schools (Close Up foundation, 2003). Bresler (2002) judges that the majority opinion written by Chief Justice William Rehnquist in the Supreme Court ruling on the final day of the 2001-2002 term, *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris,* has taken the Establishment Clause law in a new direction. He claims that Rehnquist rejected the "wall of separation" approach, (used by Thomas Jefferson) first propounded by Justice Hugo Black in *Everson v. Board of Education of Ewing* (1947) used to understand the Establishment Clause. Black used the quote in Everson to conclude that "No tax in any amount, large or small can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion" (Cited in Bresler, 2002). Even though Black permitted a state-funded program that provided funding for the transportation of children to and from both public and religious schools, Bresler is of the opinion that Black's interpretation of the Etablishment Clause would "bar all but the most-innocuous programs that could benefit religious education" (Bresler, 2002, p.15).

In *Lemon v. Kurtzman* (1972), a more-moderated three-pronged test was adopted. The Lemon test required that laws providing any assistance to religion must have a valid secular purpose; must be neutral, not having the primary effect of advancing or inhibiting religion; and must not foster an excessive entanglement with religion. The Lemon test

was later reduced to a two-pronged test in *Agostini v.* Felton (1997) combining the entanglement and the neutrality inquiry. In *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*, Rehnquist acknowledged that vouchers had a valid secular purpose and were neutral in regard to religion. He reasoned that the "assistance [goes] directly to a broad class of citizens who, in turn, direct government aid to religious schools wholly as a result of their own genuine and independent private choice" (Cited in Bresler, 2002, p. 15). *Zelman*, thus, becomes a landmark case, making the free choice of parents, regardless of the money spent or whether it is used for religious or secular purpose, a central test of the Establishment Clause (Bresler, 2002). However, Justice David Souter objected to Rehnquist's formulation in his dissent stating that the substantiality of aid to religious institutions, even if filtered through individuals, must be criterion for constitutionality.

What Does Research Say?

Parental Satisfaction

According to the United States General Accounting Office (2001), a research arm of Congress, parents using vouchers in Dayton, Ohio; New York City; and Washington, D.C. perceived their children's schools to be better than public schools on a number of indicators. Private schools had fewer students per classroom, were more likely to offer individual tutoring, and spoke to parents more frequently about their children's progress. These parents also reported less fighting, truancy, cheating, or destruction of property in the classroom.

In the New York City program parents reported the private schools were smaller than the public schools their children had previously attended with an average of two fewer students in each classroom (Mayer, Peterson, Myers, Tuttle & Howell, 2002). Only

34% of these parents reported fighting as a serious problem in their private schools while 64% said it was a problem in the public school. Another benefit cited by these parents was more communication from the school about their children. Nearly 42% of these private school parents gave their school an "A" as compared to only 10% of public school parents.

Parents of students attending private schools through the Washington, D. C. program reported similar responses as New York. The private schools were smaller with an average of five fewer students per classroom (Wolf, Peterson, & West, 2001). An even lower percentage of these parents felt fighting was a problem in the private school (26%) and 49% reported it was a problem in the public school. However 22% of the private school parents reported weapons at school a problem and 23% said it was a problem in the public schools. An overwhelming percentage of the parents in private schools (98%) said they received notes from their child's teachers as opposed to only 75% in the public school. The private school parents gave their schools an overall grade of "B" and the public schools were given an overall grade of "C+".

The results for the Dayton program were similar. The overall size of the private schools was smaller than the public schools but unlike the other two programs, the class sizes were the same in both the private and public schools (West, Peterson & Campbell, 2001). Fighting was reported as a serious problem in the public schools by 61% of the parents but only 11% said it was a serious problem in the private schools. Dayton parents did not report any significant difference in the amount of communication they received from the private school teachers versus the public school teachers. Forty percent of the

parents gave their private schools an overall grade of "A" as compared to only 11% for the public schools.

However, there were also some negative reports. Private vouchers schools in Washington, Dayton and New York were less likely than public schools to have a nurse's office, a cafeteria, or a program for learning disabled students. In addition many private schools reported difficulties retaining voucher students, a loss of 20 percent or more each year. The high turnover is attributed to extra costs associated with private schools, such as uniforms, books, and activity fees (Keynes, 2002). Other reasons for their children returning to the public schools were cited by parents of voucher students in Florida: their children simply felt more comfortable in neighborhood public schools, transportation issues and school lunch costs made private schools inaccessible, and the academics at the private schools were not up to par (Americans United for Separation of Church and State, 2002; Stephen, 2002).

Two other voucher programs have been studied, Cleveland and Milwaukee, to determine parental satisfaction. In an evaluation of the Cleveland program made after two years of implementation of vouchers there was a significant difference in parental satisfaction at the $p < .05$ level in two categories (Peterson, Howell & Greene, 1999). The two areas where parents were more satisfied at this significance level were parental involvement and teacher skills. There were seven areas where the difference in parental saisfaction was at the $p < .01$ significance level. These areas were the academic program, safety, school discipline, class size, school facility, teaching moral values, and student respect for teachers. The only area where parents are equally satisfied is with the location

of the school. However, examining these areas based on data from another study done in 2001 there are some notable discrepancies.

Dr. Kim Metcalf (2001) of the Indiana Center for Evaluation is the official evaluator for the Cleveland program and has gathered numerous data. In the study released after three years of voucher use it was found, contrary to parent's beliefs, the class sizes in both public and private schools were the same with a mean of 23. The Metcalf study found 31% of public school teachers had a master's degree as compared to only 13% of the private school teachers (Metcalf, 2001). If teaching skills improve with more training then the parents were erroneous in their belief that private school teachers had better teaching skills. In this same study, it was shown years of teaching experience of private and public school teachers did not vary significantly.

The Milwaukee voucher program began in 1990 and in 1994-95 had 771 students in 12 non-religious schools but when religious schools were allowed to participate the number of students tripled. The last evaluation conducted on the Milwaukee program was done with data collected from the first five years of the program since the law was revised in 1995 to eliminate annual evaluation (Molnar, 2001). The most significant finding in the studies deal with attrition. The rate of attrition ranges from 27% to 49% per year (Witte, Sterr, & Thorn, 1995). When parents whose children left the voucher program were asked why they dropped out, 31% said it was the quality of the program and 43% said it was the quality of the private school. In this same study parents whose children remained in the program are generally happy with their private schools with an average of 37% of the parents giving the schools an "A".

Student Achievement

Another aspect studied in all of these programs is academic acheivement. Again the results are mixed. In New York an evaluation shows no overall impact on student performance on standardized tests (Mayer, Peterson, Myers, Tuttle, & Howell, 2002). When this data was disaggregated along racial lines it was revealed African-American students did perform higher. Scores on the reading tests were 4.0 NPR points higher and were 7.0 points higher in mathematics. One problem with putting too much significance on this data is the way it was collected. Only 72% of the voucher students participated in the testing and of this number some were eliminated because they did not complete all items and others were eliminated because they found the experience overwhelming.

The three year study of the Cleveland voucher program showed no difference in reading achievement of voucher recipients on the Terra Nova tests compared to non-recipients at the end of the three years in the program (Metcalf, 2001). This study did show a significant difference in language achievement test scores after three years with a scale score of 589 for non-recipients and a score of 598 for voucher students. In math there was no significant difference between the two groups.

Achievement results in Milwaukee are only available for the first five years of the program. Using a regression model to compare Milwaukee Public Schools students with voucher students Witte (1995) found the two groups did not differ much. As a matter of fact the only difference discovered was the public schools did better in reading than the voucher students.

After two years as voucher students in Washington, D.C. African American students scored 9 national percentile points higher in combined reading and math scores

than their public school peers on the ITBS (Wolf, Peterson, & West, 2001). This same study showed no difference in scores for other ethnic groups. This data was based on test scores from only 50% of the original voucher students. The authors of this study caution about generalizing these results to a larger population since this was a very small sample.

The results were similar in Dayton, Ohio with African American students scoring 8 national percentile points higher in reading and 5 points higher in math on the ITBS (West, Peterson, & Campbell, 2001). The math score was not statistically significant. Again no difference was found for other ethnic groups.

Commentary

Sister Alicia Costa

Arnold Fege, director of government relations for the National PTA, views the voucher issue as a "battle for public resources, with $386 billion at stake" and a private sector anxious to grab its share (Saks 1997, cited in Hadderman, M. & Smith, S., 2002, Public voucher plans section, ¶ 5). For the most part private schools do not need more students, but can accommodate more. It is not a matter of seeking the demise of public schools, but rather wanting to be in partnership with public schools to help educate our struggling inner-city students.

I believe that opponents get caught up in the money issue, presuming that vouchers would drain public schools of funding. What is implied is that students will leave the public schools en masse. But that is impossible! There are not enough places for droves of students to enter private schools. What is forgotten is that "a school that 'loses' a student is also relieved of the cost of educating that student" (The Center for

Education Reform, The "Undermining America" Argument section). The money follows the child. In fact, evidence suggests the per-pupil funding in public schools may actually increase under school choice. "In Milwaukee, both per-pupil funding and overall funding for the public schools increased significantly under school choice. Total Milwaukee Public Schools spending increased from $629 million to $972 million between 1990-91 and 2000-2001 during the expansion of school choice" (The Center for Education Reform, The "Undermining America" Argument section). The majority of the bills filed in the Louisiana legislature at this time are concerned with allocating state monies only for the amount of the tuition not to exceed the state allotment per pupil expenditure. Local monies would remain within the public school district. I don't believe that students should be forced to remain in an unsatisfactory school—whether public, private, or parochial—merely to provide schools with financial support.

Another key public issue is deciding who has the right to spend the money—public providers or the consumers themselves? The U.S. Supreme Court has long recognized education programs that allow public funds to go to private, even religious groups—when parents direct the money. Pell grants and the GI bill are perfect examples of the federal government enabling college students to choose their learning institution, whether private or public or religiously affiliated. School vouchers are no different, but provide a similar support for K-12 students. Parents in private schools are already paying twice for their child's education—tuition and taxes. These parents support the local school system with their taxes and save states billions of dollars by relieving the state of the responsibility for educating their own children. It would seem that parents should have the right to choose where the money they pay in taxes goes into school support.

While tax credits, already affirmed by court rulings (Reed & Overton, 2003), may be a way to reach tax fairness and justice for nonpublic school parents, there is still the issue of children trapped in poverty whose parents are unable to choose the school they attend.

For me it is really a moral issue, a justice issue, a mission to educate inner-city children, not to be equated necessarily with a religious mission. Most of our inner-city Catholic schools are now more than half filled with non-Catholic populations. School choice vouchers provide an escape hatch for low-income parents to get their children out of failing public schools. If parents of these students deem their schools are not benefiting their children, why continue to force them to remain in it? The percentage of public school teachers and members of Congress and the State Legislature who enroll their children in private schools is staggering. They have the means to choose an alternative. The poor do not.

Vouchers can be the catalyst that helps students in failing schools immediately. It is difficult watching generation after generation of African Americans and Hispanics in this community get socialized to drugs, prison, and death in public high schools, and consistently fall behind in academics without doing anything about it. The present system has had years of turmoil in its attempt to repair itself. However, frustration only mounts over its repeated failures. In the meantime hundreds of youth are not being taught basic skills and are actually being crippled by the very system that is supposed to help them into the labor market.

Opponents point to the inconclusive research that shows no significant gains in test scores for voucher recipients. However, there is no indication that the scores are any worse. There is more to an education than academics. Character-building, moral

development, discipline, and a variety of educational experiences that are of individual interests are other aspects to an education that parents may want for their children that public schools may not provide. Parents who are seeking a safe school climate conducive to learning may not find it in their neighborhood public school. And even though the accountability system allows transfer to another public school, there are not enough available spaces in those public schools designated as successful.

Regarding accountability, high-stakes testing seems to be the current method chosen to increase student achievement in the nation's schools. However, there are those of us that believe that is not the way to go about it, and that this approach is harmful to kids. I believe that testing should be diagnostic in nature, not one that penalizes students to the point that not meeting the cutoff score can determine the whole course of a person's future, and in many cases, ends their formal education. This approach makes no concessions for students who are not of average ability and yet can still learn. One size does not fit all! Holding all students to the same expectations is not realistic. Human beings are not yet cloned with the same abilities and interests.

Recent research reported by Amrein and Berliner (2003) suggests that high-stakes testing policies have resulted in no measurable improvement in student learning and may actually alienate students from their own learning experiences, decreasing student motivation and leading to higher student retention and dropout rates. Is it then fair or even reasonable to impose such policies on private schools who are philosophically opposed to such testing? In the face of this research, requiring private schools to be accountable in the same way as public schools are now is ludicrous. Instead high-stakes testing might be reevaluated in the way it is used now for public schools.

Students are now required to attend school until they have reached the age of 16 and, in a number of states such as Louisiana, they are subjected to high-stakes testing. Retention due to failure to pass the test keeps them in grade 8 until they become of age, only then to drop out. These dropouts become a liability to society. Is this what the government would have private schools become partner to? Other educational opportunities might be offered for these students so that they may become productive citizens. While literacy is very important to the continuance of a democracy, productive individuals of various ability levels also foster its growth. Standards are a good idea in principle, but their implementation seems unfair, particularly to students who have not had the opportunity to learn in schools with few resources and poorly qualified teachers. Of course, no one can guarantee outcomes, but we have an obligation to guarantee opportunity. I believe that a more comprehensive way of looking at growth and development is needed. Education should be broader than simply taking and passing tests. Already-established private schools are successful in ways that low-performing public schools are not. To remove the freedom to prescribe its educational programs would be detrimental to private schools that are already deemed a successful enterprise.

The issue of equity, however, permeates the debate. Voucher opponents not only place the spotlight on private schools not having to take current state tests, but also point out that private schools are not required to accept all children who want to attend the school, are not required to see that every child is taught by a highly-qualified teacher, and are not required to provide parents with report cards on how well they are doing. I must take issue with the last two arguments. If private schools are to compete in the education market, they too are looking to staff their schools with highly qualified teachers.

However, private schools are subject to the same teacher shortages as public schools. Private/parochial schools must market their schools by showcasing their successes, often times this is done through the Archdiocese, in the case of Catholic schools, which publishes standardized tests averages across schools. Most of the private high schools advertise how much money was awarded in scholarships to their graduating seniors and the percentage of graduates enrolling in postsecondary institutions. The New Orleans Archdiocese uses the Stanford Test Series, 9th Edition, which is believed to be a reliable measure of how its students are performing in relation to a large national sample. The archdiocesan ACT composite is 21.3 and more than 60 percent of its graduates participate in TOPS. The aggregated norm-referenced test scores for elementary students are above the 50th percentile (Coman, 2003). I have to concur with Father Maestri, spokesman for the Archdiocese of New Orleans, Catholic schools do have accountability. They have accountability to parents and families who continue to send their children to Catholic schools in spite of the great financial sacrifice to them.

I believe we have to do everything we can to salvage the lives of our children. However, having to conform to the public school accountability system and other intrusive policies that will limit private school autonomy may be too high a price to pay. I believe that nonpublic schools must retain the right to evaluate each voucher program to ensure that using vouchers doesn't translate into sacrificing their mission. Private schools are not for everybody, but those who desire such an education should have access to one.

Siham Elsegeiny

Is the voucher program a solution for overcrowded and low performing public schools? Is the voucher program a true solution to our education problems? Will it improve education or is it more a choice for parents to choose a private education for their kids? If the issue is about improving education, there is no evidence from statistical research showing clear significant differences between students who use vouchers in private schools and their peers in public schools (Close-up Foundation, 2003). I believe that the failure of public schools to reform themselves lay in its own bureaucratic and political system and the improvement for public education will happen only by creating challenging changes within the system itself and not by moving small portions of students to the private sector and leaving the rest of the students behind.

My reasons for believing that vouchers undermine public schools are numerous. First of all, vouchers mean public schools would be left with fewer dollars to teach the poorest of the poor and other students who, for one reason or another are not private school material. Milwaukee's program is a prime example. It has resulted in a huge budget shortfall, leaving the public schools scrambling for funds (Anti-Defamation League, 2001). Also, vouchers are not universally popular. Voters in nineteen states have rejected voucher-like programs. While twenty states have introduced voucher bills, only two have been put into law. Further more, students using vouchers do not learn more than they would have if they had stayed in public schools. There is no solid evidence that the voucher system improves schools or raises student test scores (Close-up Foundation, 2003). I believe that vouchers send a message to the parents, and to the public in general,

to give up on public education. I believe the voucher program will ultimately put public school funding at risk.

The *No Child Left Behind Act* demands accountability from public school, teachers, and students. Private schools are not obligated to such standards of accountability. Private schools do not have to take any current state examinations or the newly required annual tests nor are they required to accept all students (Democratic policy committee, 2002). The educational bureaucracy with the state regulations or accountability plan would have a difficult time keeping their hands off private schools. This will ultimately lead to the loss of private school autonomy and independence. This will put an end to the "separation of church and state" ideal, which our country was founded upon. There is no requirement in the voucher proposals demanding that schools receiving vouchers must accept all students; therefore, there is no requirement that private schools serve students with limited English proficiency, special education students, homeless students, or students with discipline problems (Democratic policy committee, 2002).

Ninety-nine percent students using vouchers choose religious schools. Parents make this choice because they want a religious education for their children or because religious schools offer the cheapest tuition in the private sector. In this case, I believe, as a former principal for a religious school, that there is no harm in teaching religion as long as the schools do not participate or foster any unlawful behavior or teach hatred of any person or group on the basis of race, national origin, or religion. But I also believe as an educator, that any private school who accepts students using the voucher program should

live within the state guidelines of annual standardized tests to evaluate students' academic progress.

Ellen Lusco

The purpose of the voucher program is to ensure every student receives a quality education. While the theory driving the voucher system is plausible, the reality of the system may have tragic consequences for the public school system as well as students. I believe there are many inequities that must be addressed and resolved. Therefore, I am vehemently opposed to any type of voucher program that allows some students to attend private and parochial schools on taxpayer monies.

First, those in favor of voucher programs have argued that students in high poverty areas are sent to schools with a lack of resources and social networks as well as the least qualified teachers. I beg to differ. Having worked in high poverty schools, resources and quality teachers are readily available. In Terrebonne Parish schools, we have a wealth of programs funded through Title I programs for the disadvantaged. In fact, upon looking at data from the Louisiana State Department of Education, I have found that most of the teachers in Terrebonne Parish public school system are certified. Also, the number of teachers with graduate degrees is not any higher at higher performing schools. In fact, if a teacher does not pass the requirements of the Louisiana Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program, that teacher is required to leave the public school system for at least two years. Somehow these teachers can get hired into the private school system.

Second, I am concerned with the fact that there are stipulations on which students the private and parochial schools will be required to educate. Private schools may not be required to accept discipline problems and use the excuse that they are not equipped to

handle the special education population. Is this considered equity in education? Is this giving every child an equal opportunity to receive a quality education? According to Public Law 94-142, every child has the right to a free public education. If tax dollars are extended into the private schools, should every child now not have the right to a free private education?

If private schools are not required to work with every type of student population, they can naturally claim to be more successful than their public counterparts. At this point, private schools can choose whom they want to educate and whom they do not wish to educate. If they want to accept the tax dollars, they should have to accept all students and the same accountability program public schools face. Perhaps it would be a good dose of reality. I consider it a valid issue that private schools can simply expel students while public schools must still attempt to educate these same students via alternative schools or allowing students back on campus at their base school on contract.

Third, public school teachers are constantly being accused of teaching to the standardized tests. I would argue that these teachers are actually doing their jobs. I am not implying that teachers should take questions from the test. However, I am suggesting that the benchmarks and the tests are aligned. If one is "teaching to the test," is he/she not teaching the standards and benchmarks?

I know that our school systems are not perfect. I believe one of the biggest problems with some teachers in the school system is that tenure has been abused. Some teachers who are tenured feel as though they cannot be fired or should not be required to follow the guidelines of their administrators. We all know that it is very difficult to fire a tenured teacher even if he/she is not doing the job for which he/she is being paid.

While I agree we do have some problem teachers in the school system, I believe the reasons for poor performance is not only a school system problem. Even though it is politically incorrect to bring up this point, part of the problem with some of the lower performing schools is the clientele in these schools. I believe it is our responsibility as educators to teach every child. However, it is difficult to conquer apathy on the part of students and parents. Parents must be required to share some of the responsibility for their children's education. It is so easy to blame the teachers and schools for low performance.

I am confident in my opinion to make a challenge to the private and parochial school systems. If they feel their teachers are so much more qualified, we could evenly trade teachers from one of the lower performing schools with those teachers from one of the local private or parochial schools. These teachers would be required to teach at a low performing school for one year while our public school teachers would teach at their private school for one year. If the public school students show a positive gain, perhaps vouchers need to be implemented. However, I believe the private schools would maybe be a little more able to understand how hard our public school system works to teach every child including behavior problems and special needs populations.

Finally, pulling students out of public schools may cause more harm than good. I believe the public school system will be left with the most apathetic students and parents. Of course, these schools will fail. It will be harder to acquire and retain the many highly qualified and dedicated teachers at the poorer schools because they are being consistently labeled as less qualified. The students with uninvolved parents will lose even more. Again, is that equitable?

Jean Pinney

Vouchers have been proposed in Louisiana once again as the solution to failing schools. If there was any conclusive evidence vouchers work then I would be in favor of them. After all, education is about the children not the system. In all of the research uncovered on existing voucher programs the evidence of a positive impact on student acheivement has been mixed. The Harvard studies all report a positive impact on achievement of African-American voucher students but when you look into the studies further you find some questionable research being done. In the New York City study the baseline scores of the voucher students in reading was higher than the control group (public school students) but the so-called achievement gains compared the scores of the public school median and the voucher students' median scores after three years (Mayer, Peterson, Myers, Tuttle, & Howell, 2002). My question is – wouldn't it be logical if the voucher students already were higher for their scores to continue to outpace their peers no matter where they went to school? Even more questionable was the fact 85% of the lottery students came from the lowest performing schools so after pulling the higher scoring students from the schools they compared test results. The analysis should have been done comparing gains of individual students against their previous scores not a median score for each group. Other problems I have with this study include the small percentage of voucher students participating in the data collection (67%), discarding results of students who completed too few test items, and excusing students from testing who were overwhelmed by the experience. As an administrator I would love to be able to

discard tests which were not completed or excuse any students who were "overwhelmed" by the testing. I would be a school of distinction if I could do that!

The Washington, D.C. study raises similar questions regarding the results. There are some differences between the studies I feel are significant. In New York the voucher program is only for grades K-5 but in Washington it is for grades K-9. The baseline scores for the voucher students going into grades 3-6 were not significantly different from the non-voucher students but for those going into grades 7-9 the reading and math scores were significantly higher (Wolf, Peterson, & West, 2001). The study in Washington also showed students who used their vouchers came from more financially and educationally advantaged families. Both of these factors show the "creaming" effect of vouchers. Just as in New York, vouchers took away the better students and then compared results between groups. The data from Washington is based on an even smaller percentage of voucher users than New York. Only 53% of the students offered a scholarship used them and this data was collected after two years when only 38% of the 53% were still using them. To compound this issue even further, only 50% of those students were included in the study. A mathematical example would be 1000 students were offered the vouchers, 530 took them and after two years only 201 remained and this data was collected on 100 of them. Could this possibly mean anything? Were the ones remaining and taking the follow-up tests only the most successful students? Again, let me test only my most successful students and my school will be rated as the best in the state! Other problems with this study are vouchers were only given to students after they gained admission to the private school of their choice which meant students had to meet the criteria of these schools, very few learning disabled students were included in the

program, test scores were worse for the voucher group in reading after one year, and students already in private schools were also offered the vouchers.

My next argument against vouchers is the belief private and parochial schools do a better job of educating students. What evidence is there in Louisiana this is true? The Archdiocese wants to point to ACT score differences as an indicator. The difference between public school median scores and Archdiocese schools are not significant. Another issue is with standardized testing. The Archdiocese uses the Stanford 9 which shows average as between 23% and 73% but the public schools use the Iowa tests which show average between 45% and 75% so if you compare the number of students scoring in the average range obviously the Archdiocese will have more. Private and parochial schools do not have to accept all students as the public schools do. Public school test data includes Learning Disabled students and Behavior/ Emotionally Disordered students who often cannot sit still long enough to finish a test. Public schools are being held accountable for teaching ALL students to a high standard and any school which receives public money should also be held to these same standards via testing using the same measures. On Channel 8 Father Maestri of the New Orleans Archdiocese stated it was unfair to test their students on the same tests since the Catholic schools' curriculum differs from the one taught in the public schools (Snell, 2003). This is a major problem since the curriculum in the public schools is based on the state's Standards and Benchmarks which come from the National Standards and Benchmarks. ALL schools should be focused on these National Standards and Benchmarks. If the Catholic schools are not following these then they are shortchanging their students.

My final argument against vouchers is a money issue. If the state removes their portion of aid for every student from a school which uses a voucher then the remaining students will suffer. The argument is the schools will actually have more money to use since they still have the local portion of aid for these students without actually having to educate these students. The only way this would be beneficial is if an entire class of a grade level would choose vouchers. If a school only loses 5 or 6 students per grade level, a teacher must still be hired for those grades for the remaining students but with $15,000 to $18,000 less per grade. This is more than half of a teacher's annual salary.

Vouchers will only bring harm and a greater gap between the academically ablest and least able students' access to a quality education. They have not been proven to enhance achievement for all students and the number of students impacted will not be significant. It shouold come as no surprise to anyone that this issue is gaining prominence at a time when Catholic and private school enrollment is declining. This may be a way out for them so they do not have to close any more schools, add eighth grade onto the high school campuses, or make traditionally all male schools accept females or vice-versa.

References

A long road to the court (2002). *Education Week, 21*(42), 18-21.

American Education Reform Council. (2001a). Cleveland *scholarship and tutoring program*. Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://schoolchoiceinfo.org/img/pdf/CSTP.pdf

American Education Reform Council. (2001b). Florida *A + opportunity scholarship program and McKay scholarships for students with disabilities program*. Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://schoolchoiceinfo.org/img/pdf/Florida.pdf

American Education Reform Council. (2001c). Milwaukee *parental choice program*. Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://schoolchoiceinfo.org/img/pdf/MPCP.pdf

American Institutes of Research. (2000). *Vouchers*. Handbook Update Project. Retrieved, February 8, 2003, from http://nces.ed.gov/forum/pdf/finance_voucher.pdf

Americans United for Separation of Church and State. (2001, November). Government aid and religious schools: 70 years of controversy. *Church & State*. Retrieved March 7, 2003, from http://www.au.org/churchstate/cs11012.htm

Americans United for Separation of Church and State. (2002, December). Fla. Voucher students decide to return to public education. *Church & State*. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/703/791/31922308w6/purl=rcl_GRGM

Americans United for Separation of Church and State. (2003a, January). Education law could lead to vouchers, critics say. *Church & State*. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from

http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/703/791/31922308w6/purl=rcl_GRGM

Americans United for Separation of Church and State. (2003, January). Pro-voucher and religious right legal groups *Church & State*. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/703/791/31922308w6/purl=rcl_GRGM

Amrein, A.L., & Berliner, D.C. (2003). A research report: The effects of high-stakes testing on student motivation and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 60(5), 32-38.

Anti-Defamation League. (2001). *School vouchers: The wrong choice for public education*. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from http://www.adl.org/vouchers

Bresler, R. (2002, September). Vouchers and the constitution II. *USA Today*, 131(2688), p. 15. Retrieved February 25, 2003, from http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com

Bruneau, P. (2003) *House Bill No.854*. Retrieved March 25, 2003, from Louisiana State Legislature Web Site: http://www.legis.state.la.us/leg-docs/03RS?CUT6/OUT/0000JXFW.pdf

Close Up Foundation. (2003). *Current issues: Critical policy choices facing the nation and the world*. Alexandria, VA: Close Up Publishing.

Coman, J. R. (2003, April 6). Archdiocese defends schools' standardized tests. *The Times Picayune*, p. B6.

Crane, R. (2003). *House Bill No. 1337*. Retrieved April 2, 2003, from Louisiana State Legislature Web Site: http://www.legis.state.la.us/leg-docs/

Cozzens, L. (1995). *Brown v. Board of Education*. Retrieved March 5, 2003, from http://www.watson.org/~lisa/blackhistory/early-civilrights/brown.html

Danielson, C. (2002). *Enhancing student achievement: A framework for school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dean, L. (2003, July) *Senate Bill No. 943*. Retrieved March 25, 2003, from Louisiana State Legislature Web Site: http://www.legis.state.la.us/leg.docs/03RS/CUT8/OUT/0000K1GD.pdf

Democratic Policy Committee. (2002, October). Issues in elementary and secondary education: Private school vouchers. *Democratic Sourcebook*. Washington, D.C.: DPC Graphics/Publications Office.

Elie, L. E. (2003, February 5). Vouchers oughtn't be LEAP-free. *The Times Picayune*, p. B1.

Greene, J., (2001, February). An evaluation of the Florida A-Plus accountability and school choice program. *The Manhattan Institute for Policy Research*.

Hadderman, M. & Smith, S. (2002). Intersectional choice plans. In *Trends and Issues: School Choice*. University of Oregon. Retrieved February 12, 2003, from http://eric.uoregon.edu/trends_issues/choice/intersectional.html

Hepburn, C. R. (1999). Straight A's for school choice. The Fraser Institute. Retrieved February 26, 2003, from http://oldfraser.lexi.net/media/media_releases/1999/19990922.html

Johnson, S. (2003) *Senate Bill No. 807*. Retrieved April 2, 2003 from the Louisiana State Legislature Web Site: http://www.legis.state.la.us/leg.docs/

Keynes, A. (2002, October 2). GAO: Parents endorse private school vouchers. *Education Daily*. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from

http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/703/791/31922308w6/purl=rcl_GRGM

Kowalski, T.J. (2000). *Public relations in schools.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Krupa, M. (2003, February 21). State school board opposes vouchers. *The Times Picayune*, p. A3.

Library of Congress. (n.d). S.717. In *Thomas legislative information on the internet.* Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?c107:2:./temp/~c107vq32jf:

Library of Congress. (n.d). S.2883. In *Thomas legislative information on the internet.* Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/C?c107:./temp/~c107lrVGGy

Louisiana Office of School Accountability (2003). *The Louisiana school and district accountability system.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Maggi, L. (2001, August 1). Voucher program off to a slow start. In NOLA.com: Everything New Orleans. *The Times Picayune.* Retrieved *February* 5, 2003, from http://www.nola.com/news/t-p/frontpage/index.ssf?/newstory/acluo1_2.html

Mayer, D., Peterson, P., Myers, D., Tuttle, C., & Howell, W. (2002, February 19). School choice in New York City after three years: An evaluation of the school choice scholarships program. *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.* # 8404-045.

Michot, Hainkel, & Lancaster (2003). *Senate Bill No. 985.* Retrieved March 25, 2003, from Louisiana Legislature Web Site: http://www.legis.state.la.us/leg-docs/03RS/CUT2/OUT/0000K/JO.pdf

Metcalf, K. (2001, September). *Cleveland scholarship program evaluation, 1998-2000 technical report*. Retrieved March 25, 2003, from Indiana Center for Evaluation, Indiana University Web Site: http://www.indiana.edu/~iuice/

Molnar, A. (2001, May 6). *School vouchers: The law, the research, and public policy implications*. Retrieved February 25, 2003, from University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Center for Education Research, Analysis, and Innovation Web site: http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/CERAI/documents/publications/cerai-01-17.html

Nagourney, A. (2002, June 29). Analysis: With constitutional issue decided, voucher debate turns to how they will work. *New York Times New Service*. Retrieved February 16, 2003, from http://cfapps.naplesnews.com/sendlink/printthis.cfm

National PTA. (2001, February). *National PTA background brief: Vouchers*. Retrieved February 14, 2003, from http://www.pta.org/programs/bbvouchers.htm

Nolan, B. (2001, September 5). Voucher program begins in N.O. *The Time Picayune*. In School Choice Info-School Choice News. Retrieved February 11, 2003, from http://www.schoolchoiceinfo.org/news/?id=318&action=article&oldAction=categorySearch&category=9

Peterson, P., Howell, W., & Greene, J. (1999, June). *An evaluation of the Cleveland voucher program after two years*. Retrieved March 28, 2003, from Taubman Center on Sate and Local Government, Harvard University Web Site: http://data.fas.harvard.edu/pepg

Rauch, J. (2002, October). Reversing white flight: Even if vouchers don't improve schools, they will almost certainly improve neighborhoods. *The Atlantic Monthly*. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from

http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/703/791/31922308w6/purl=rcl_GRGM

Reed, L. W., & Overton, J. P. (2003, January). The future of school choice. *USA Today*. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/703/791/31922308w6/purl=rcl_GRGM

Reed, L. W., & Overton, J. P. (2003). The future of school choice. *USA Today, 131*(2692), 49-51.

Robelen, E. W. (2001, Susgust 8). Louisiana plan to subsidize pre-K in religious schools draws fire [Electronic Version]. *Education Week*, 20(43), 29.

Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (2002, September). The 34th annual Phi Delta Kappa/ Gallup Poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 84(1), 41-57.

Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (2002, November). Pulse of the public: A follow-up on the voucher issue. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 84(3), 184.

Scibelli, S. (2001, April 25). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Retrieved March 3, 2003, from http://web.syr.edu/~skscibel/6.html

Scott, R. T. (2003, February 4). Education, economic growth top Foster's session agenda. *The Times Picayune*, p. A3.

Sentell, W., & Millhollon, M. (2001, August 1). Foster to give ACLU documents on plan to help nonpublic schools. *The Baton Rouge Advocate*. In. In School Choice Info-School Choice News. Retrieved March 7, 2003, from http://www.schoolchoiceinfo.org/news/?id=303&action=article&oldAction=categorySearch&category=9

Snell, J. (Reporter). (2003, April 5). *Channel 8 News* [Television broadcast]. New Orleans, LA: Fox Network.

Stephen, A. (2002, December 9). Charter schools and vouchers were supposed to be the magic bullets to improve education. But nobody has yet found any evidence that either idea is working. *New Statesman*. Retrieved February 20, 2003, from http://web6.infotrac.galegroup.com/itw/infomark/703/791/31922308w6/purl=rcl_GRGM

Superintendents vote against vouchers. (2003, March 7). *The Times Picayune*, p. A2.

Supreme Court decisions on privacy: Pierce v. Society of Sisters (1925). (2003). In Agnosticism/Atheism. *What You Need to Know About*. Retrieved March 5, 2003, from http://atheism.about.com/library/decisions/privacy/bl_l_PierceSociety.htm

The Center for education Reform. (2002). Nine Lies About School Choice: Answering the Critics. Retrieved February 25, 2003, from http://edreform.com/pubs/ninelies_inside.htm

The Fraser Institute. (2002). The case for school choice: executive summary. *In Critical Issues*. Retrieved February 26, 2003, from http://www.fraserinstitute.ca

Thevenot, B., & Scott, R. T. (2003, February 4). Foster pushes student vouchers. *The Times Picayune*, pp. A1, A4.

Tucker, R. (2003). *House Bill No. 1739*. Retrieved April 2, 2003 from the Louisiana State Legislature Web Site: http://www.legis.state.la.us/leg_docs/

United States General Accounting Office. (2001, August). School vouchers: Publicly funded programs in Cleveland and Milwaukee. Retrieved March 5, 2003, from http://www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-01-914

U.S. Department of Education. (2002a). No *Child Left Behind*. Retrieved February 17, 2003, from http://www.nclb.gov/next/stats/index.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2002b). Paige *Issues Statement on Today's Supreme Court Case*. Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/PressReleases/02-2002/02202002.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2002c). Supreme *Court Affirms Parents' Right to Choose the Best Education for Their Children*. Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/PressReleases/06-2002/06272002e.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2002d). Zelman *vs. Simmons-Harris: The Cleveland School Choice Case*. Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/PressReleases/02-2002/06272002e.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2002e). Federal *Government History of Support to Private and Religious Groups: Expanded Educational Opportunities for Americans*. Retrieved February 8, 2003, from http://www.ed.gov/PressReleases/06-2002/06272002b.html

Waller, M. (2003, February 8). Private schools chief wary of vouchers. *The Times Picayune*, pp. B1, B2.

Walsh, M. (2002). Supreme Court upholds program aiding religious schools [Electronic version]. *Education Week*, 19(41), Web only. Retrieved March 7, 2003, from http://www.edweek.org/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=41helmsweb.h19

Walsh, M. (2002). Voucher advocates plan a multistate legal battle [Electronic version]. *Education Week*, 22(07), 17-19.

West, M., Peterson, P., & Campbell, D. (2001, August). *School choice in Dayton, Ohio after two years: an evaluation of the parents advancing choice in education scholarship program*. Retrieved February 11, 2003, from Taubman Center on State and Local Government, Harvard University Web Site: http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/pepg

Witte, J., Sterr, T., & Thorn, C. (1995, December). *Fifth-year report Milwaukee parental choice program*. Madison, Wisconsin: The Robert M. LaFollette Institute of Public Affairs.

Wolf, P., Peterson, P., & West, M. (2001, August). *Results of a school voucher experiment: the case of Washington, D.C. after two years*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association. San Francisco, California.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM035417

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Vouchers: A School Choice	
Author(s): Sister Alicia Costa, Siham El-Seginy, Ellen Lusco, Jean Pi	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

[X]

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

[ ]

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

[ ]

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Jean Pinney	Printed Name/Position/Title: Jean Pinney
Organization/Address: UNO, Lakeshore Dr., New Orleans, LA	Telephone: (504) 431-8210 FAX: (504) 436-0604
	E-Mail Address: LaTeam@aol.com Date: 11/5/03

(Over)